DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 315 942 EC 222 092

AUTHOR Dworet, Donald H.; Rathgeber, Arthur J.
TITLE Behaviour Disorders in Canada's Schools: A Second Look.
PUB DATE Apr 89
NOTE 49p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children (67th, San Francisco, CA, April 1-4, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Disorders; Definitions; *Educational Policy; *Educational Practices; Elementary Secondary Education; Eligibility; Foreign Countries; Handicap Identification; Incidence; Mainstreaming; National Surveys; Preservice Teacher Education; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; School Funds; State Departments of Education; *State Standards; Student Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Canada

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the state of educational law, standards, resources, and interventions for students with behavior disorders in Canada. Data were primarily gathered through a mail survey of 12 provincial and territorial departments of education. Definitions for behavior disorder are presented, as used by each province. Prevalence figures, labels and terminology used, services available, standards (such as maximum number of students per class and resource teacher caseloads), eligibility for services, reintegration criteria, and figures on successful mainstreaming are also given for each province. Assessment techniques, funding, and special teacher training requirements are discussed. Changes in government policies toward behaviorally disordered students since 1981 are examined. Recommendations are offered in the areas of personnel, research, and organization of services. (PB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED315942

Behaviour Disorders in Canada's Schools: A Second Look

Donald H. Dworet

Faculty of Education, Brock University

Arthur J. Rathgeber

Nipissing University College

Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children, San Francisco, California, April 1-4, 1989.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Donald Dworet
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC222092

Behaviour Disorders in Canada's Schools: A Second Look

The student who tests our teaching methods; the student who defies authority; the student who is often rejected by regular classroom teachers; the student who experiences rejection from peers; the student who lacks self-control, is generally characterized as Behaviourally Disordered. In addition to their difficulties in school, these students often lack the parent group to advocate for their needs. The explosive nature of these students and their inability to adapt to their environments create a challenge for the most responsible school systems and can frustrate a less responsible system to the point of providing less than adequate service. Strong leadership at the provincial/state level may be more critical to these students than to other handicapped groups because of the major discipline challenge to our schools and the lack of parent advocacy.

At the present time we cannot even adequately identify all the students who are experiencing behavioural disorders that interfere with their educational or social growth. Kauffman (1985, p.27) suggests that in the United States "at any given time 2%

is a conservative estimate of the school population that needs special education because of behavioural disorders." However, only .8% of the school population is identified as behaviourally disordered and receiving service in the United States (Gearheart et al., 1988). Large numbers of American children are without service.

Due to the limited literature similar statements cannot be made about Canada. An examination of Canadian efforts is critical given the difficulties apparent in the American system that has responsible and responsive federal legislation in the form of P.L. 94-142 to protect the rights of all exceptional children and yet it is still not serving all who are in need. Similar national legislation is not possible in Canada given the provincial jurisdiction of education. All provinces do not have mandatory legislation which would provide the same protection under the law as P.L. 94-142. Without similar protection under the law, there may be a larger number of behaviourally disordered children not receiving service in Canada.

Provincial/territorial governments and school systems require background information to develop a plan of action for behaviourally disordered students. Information collected and analyzed in survey research is the starting point for many decisions and is essential

for more focused research. Canadian literature lacks descriptions of educational programs for behaviourally disordered students. Given this present condition, decisions with regard to programming may be based on program descriptions from other countries which would not reflect the Canadian social context nor would another country's program account for Canada's unique political climate.

The purpose of this study is to provide current information to assist with the decision-making process at the Department of Education level in the provinces and territories across Canada. This study will not only be descriptive, but will also examine the changes in the policies of the provincial/territorial governments towards behaviourally disordered students over a seven year period by comparing the current results with those of a similar study carried out by Csapo in 1981.

An early well-known special education study done in Canada is <u>One Million Children</u>--more commonly referred to as the CELDIC REPORT (Roberts & Lazure, 1970). This report was an examination of programs across Canada: "For three years we looked at Canada, through the eyes of a child. We travelled widely; we questioned and listenened; we poked and probed." (p.1)

In this ambitious study, with committee representation from every region of Canada, the magnitude of the problem was apparent given this statement: "Conservative estimates tell us that one child in eight, or one million Canadians under twenty years of age, have an emotional or learning disorder that will prevent optimal development unless some intervention takes place."

This 1970 national study could still be used in the '80's to develop goal statements for many school systems. With regard to service delivery, this study suggested:

When, because of his need, and not ours, a child must be removed for a period of specialized treatment, our goal should be continually to review his progress so that our assistance can be revised regularly with the objective of returning him as rapidly as is appropriate to the normal stream" (p. 3).

The recommendations from this report include three general areas: Personnel, Research, and Organization of Services. A key recommendation directed to the provincial/territorial governments was: "...that provincial governments in cooperation with private agencies work progressively towards the establishment of a comprehensive integrated network of services fully

accessible to all children in their home communities." (p. 484).

This ambitious effort in 1970 with its regional representation and insightful recommendations has formed the bench mark for subsequent efforts by provincial/territorial government initiatives for behaviourally disordered students.

A second key report that should be reflected in current provincial/territorial practice in the area of behavioural disorders is the SEECC REPORT. Standards For Educators Of Exceptional Children in Canada (Council for Exceptional Children, Canadian Committee, 1971) is an exellent second step in making adequate provisions for students with emotional and learning disorders. This report addresses a broad range of issues in addition to some recommendations to provincial/ territorial departments of education. One of the most relevant recommendations that can also be evaluated in subsequent studies is: "...review existing and enact new legislation and fiscal support to ensure that all exceptional children have access to appropriate educational services to meet their individual needs" (p. 132).

An initial attempt at addressing the level of service for one area of exceptionality was done by Csapo in 1981. Csapo had provincial directors of Special Education complete a survey on provincial/territorial services for emotionally disturbed children in Canada. The 19 item questionnaire was adapted from the work of Hirshoren et al., (1970). Csapo's study examined responses to questions on the educational provisions available for Behaviourally Disordered students in their jurisdictions. The items on the questionnaire sought information in the following areas:

1. definition of behavioural disorder
2. labels used to denote behavioural disorder
3. prevalence of behavioural disorder
4. types of service available for behavioural disorder students
5. diagnosis and placement for behavioural disorder student
6. behavioural disorder class and caseload size
7. administrative organization
8. success of the behavioural disorder program based on the integration of student into the regular classroom
9. criteria used to determine behavioural disorder program effectiveness

10. specific training required for teachers of behavioural disorder students
11. behavioural disorder program funding formulae
12. alternatives to public school placement for behavioural disorder students

In the summary section of her study, Csapo indicated that the lack of clarity with regard to the definition continues to result in difficulties in comparing programs across provinces/territories. This also interferes with research and in coming to an agreement concerning what behaviourally disordered students have in common. Another difficulty noted from this study was the wide variance in prevalence figures. An obvious contributing factor is the lack of consensus on the definition. Another important finding that has implications for future planning is the indication from the survey that only five provinces/territories had mandatory legislation in place. Csapo stated that the recommendations of early reports such as the CELDIC REPORT and SEECC REPORT have not been fully realized. The central weakness identified by Csapo (1981) was: "...the lack of recognition and lack of adequate prevention and remediation of problems relating to the education of emotionally disturbed children across the nation" (p. 148).

As seven years have passed since Csapo wrote these words, it was believed essential by the authors of the current study to re-assess what was happening across Canada. By doing so, a determination can be made as to improvements that were made and what still needs to be done. The purposes of this study, therefore, were:

1. To describe programs for behaviourally disordered students in Canada as seen by the directors of special education in the provinces/territories;
2. To compare these descriptions with the Csapo Study;
3. To make recommendations for future action.

In order to determine current issues in the educating of behaviourally disordered students throughout Canada, an instrument similar to Csapo's (1981) survey was sent to each Provincial and Territorial Department or Ministry of Education. A 100% return rate was achieved.

Definitions of Emotional Disturbance for Public School Purposes by Provincial/Territorial Law, Rules or Regulations

Csapo (1981) reported that six out of twelve jurisdictions had official definitions. These included

Alberta, British Columbia, Ontario, Quebec, Saskatchewan, and Yukon Territory. The results of the current study found that ten out of twelve jurisdictions have official definitions. Nova Scotia and the Northwest Territories are the only jurisdictions without an official definition.

Two provinces, Ontario and Newfoundland, have definitions similar to the federal one in the United States. This definition has its origins in early descriptions of emotionally or behaviourally disordered children provided by Bower and Lambert (1971) and is part of the regulations for the American mandatory legislation P.L. 94-142 (The Education for All Handicapped Persons Act). Ontario officials indicated that the current definition is being examined (D. Allan, personal communication, January 1988).

With the provinces/territories having complete jurisdiction over education, much confusion would result if a comparison of programs was attempted across Canada. Within certain provinces a comparison would also be quite difficult because the majority of the provincial/territorial governments permit local school systems to develop their own definitions. Eight of the twelve provinces/territories allow local school systems to adapt the provincial/territorial definition. The

four provinces that do not allow for changing the definition include Newfoundland, Ontario, Prince Edward Island, and Saskatchewan.

In British Columbia, the definition can be changed at the local level but the Ministry of Education must approve. This situation is similar in the Yukon Territory. The Ministry must approve the definition change requested by the local school system. In Manitoba, modification of the definition is required only when financial support from the Department of Education is being re-negotiated. Saskatchewan allows school districts to modify the definitions and receive funding if a school district forms a committee which is charged with the responsibility to determine which children should be designated socially, emotionally, or behaviourally disabled. It is Saskatchewan's position however, that medical evaluation is preferred whenever possible.

Definitions of Behavioural/Emotional Disorders Across Canada

Alberta.

"Severe Behavioural/Psychiatric Disorder" (the following definition is used to provide limited provincial funding): "Bizarre behaviour such as extreme

hyperactivity, self-stimulation, dangerous aggressiveness, distractiveness, and/or impulsivenenss. Clinically diagnosed psychiatric disorders requiring constant supervision."

British Columbia.

"Students with severe behaviour problems are those who exhibit a variety of longstanding and chronic deviant behaviours. These behaviours can be exhibited through impulsiveness, aggressiveness, depression and withdrawal. The severely behaviourally disordered child may also demonstrate bizarre and inappropriate behaviour including self-injury, destructiveness, crying and feelings of inferiorty. These students frequently exhibit a significant discrepancy between performance and potential. Their behaviours are so profoundly inappropriate that they significantly interfere with the academic process of self and others."

Manitoba.

"A child who, as determined by an appropriate psychological assessment administered by a certified specialist, shows very severe emotional and social behavioural problems and must receive an intensive specific educational program to ameliorate the emotional and social problems."

New Brunswick.

"An emotionally or behaviourally disordered pupil exhibits excessive, chronic, deviant behaviours which interfere with social and/or academic learning and development to the extent that special modifications are required in the pupil's educational program.

- excessive is the degree and frequency of behaviour, either active or passive
- chronic is the persistence of the behaviour over a period of time
- deviant is the inappropriateness of the behaviour when the pupil's age, gender, mental development, physical development and environment are taken into consideration
- pupil's adaptive behaviour is impaired to a degree which would make it impossible for him/her to function in full-time attendance in a regular classroom without support services or an adjusted program."

Newfoundland.

"A student is deemed behaviourally disturbed if the child frequently demonstrates one or more of the following characteristics over a long period of time, and to a marked degree, which adversely affects educational performance.

1) A marked inability to learn which cannot be adequately explained by intellectual, sensory, neurophysiological or general health factors.

2) A consistent inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers or teachers.

3) Highly age and/or sex inappropriate behaviours or feelings within normal situations.

4) A general pervasive mood of acute unhappiness or depression.

5) A tendency to develop symptoms such as speech problems, pains or fears, associated with personal or school problems."

Northwest Territories.

"No official definition but general recognition by Regional Special Needs Coordinator that a behaviourally/emotionally disturbed child is one whose emotional and behavioural difficulties impair educational performance. Once identified on this basis, an I.E.P. is developed for that child."

Nova Scotia.

"A definition or label in educational settings is rarely used. Where used it is defined by Mental Health Centre Specialists."

Ontario

"A learning disorder characterized by specific behaviour problems over such a period of time, and to such a marked degree, and of such a nature, as to adversely affect educational performance, and that may be accompanied by one or more of the following:

a) an inability to build or maintain interpersonal relationships

b) excessive fears or anxieties

c) a tendency to compulsive reaction

d) an inability to learn that cannot be traced to intellectual, sensory, or other health factors, or any combination thereof (Ministry of Education, 1984)."

Prince Edward Island.

"We use the term severely behaviourally emotionally disturbed when the children are too disturbed to function in the classroom or let anyone else do so, in terms of a school program."

Quebec.

"An emotionally/behaviourally disordered pupil is one who according to his/her psycho-social evaluation (either systematic observation or standardized tests administered by qualified people) has a significant deficiency in being able to adapt and interact with one

or more of the following environments - school, family, social."

Saskatchewan.

"When a thorough diagnostic study by medical and educational personnel acceptable to the Minister affirms that the pupil exhibits excessive chronic deviant behaviours which adversely affects educational performance."

Yukon Territory.

"Students whose needs cannot be fully met within the framework of a regular classroom program due to behavioural difficulties."

Prevalence

In response to the question of provincial prevalence rates there appears to be a wide discrepancy from province to province. The range goes from a low of .0003% to a high of 2%. Nova Scotia, Ontario, Prince Edward Island, Quebec and Yukon Territory did not include prevalence rates in their survey returns. Saskatchewan based its rate on U.S. Office of Education information, not on actual provincial data.

Csapo's study reported that only two of the twelve jursidictions provided prevalence figures. These two provinces/territories were Manitoba and the Yukon

Territory. Manitoba reported that the 3% - 5% represented the most severe cases. In 1988, Manitoba indicated that the prevalence figure was .5 - 2% depending on the definition used. The Yukon Territory provided a 1981 figure of 12 - 20% No prevalence figure was provided in the 1988 survey for the Yukon. Of the two provinces where comparisons might have been possible, only Manitoba has provided information that can be utilized in this regard. In this case, there is a lower number of behavioural disordered students in 1988 than there were in 1981.

Table 1 indicates current prevalence figures provided by each jurisdiction.

Table 1

Prevalence Rate of Behaviourally Disordered Children Across Canada

	Prevalency figure	How determined
Alberta	1%	by major school boards
British Columbia	.53%	actual rate across province
Manitoba	.5 - 2%	according to definition used
New Brunswick	1%	actual figure as of January 1984
Newfoundland	1%	not indicated
Northwest Territories	.0003%	not indicated
Nova Scotia	not provided	
Ontario	.45%	Ministry records
Prince Edward Island	.0004%	not indicated
Quebec	not provided	
Saskatchewan	2%	based on U.S. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
	.0002%	severely behaviourally disordered currently identified in province
Yukon Territory	not provided	

Labels

As can be seen from examining Table 2, the terms used in Canada vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. A positive sign, however, is that four provinces avoid the term emotionally disturbed preferring to use the term behaviour disorder while another three provinces use the term "behavioural" as part of the definition. This term provides a more accurate description of these students' difficulties (Walker; 1982) and according to Feldman et al., (1983) is less stigmatizing than the label emotionally disturbed.

Table 2

Labels or Terminology Applied to Deviant Behaviour: A Comparison of Labels Across Provinces/Territories

	Csapo (1981)	1988
Alberta	Socially maladjusted	Behavioural disorder
British Columbia	Severe behaviour	Severe behaviour
Manitoba	Severely emotionally disturbed	Very severely emotionally disturbed - severely psychotic
New Brunswick	Emotionally disturbed and/or behaviour disordered	Emotionally/ behaviourally disordered
Newfoundland	Severely emotionally disturbed	behaviourally disturbed
Northwest Territories	--	No official terms
Nova Scotia	As labelled by Mental Health Department	No term used
Ontario	Severely emotionally disturbed	Behaviourally exceptional

Prince Edward Island	Severely emotionally disturbed	Emotionally/ behaviourally disturbed
Quebec (translation)	Socio-emotional problems	Socio-affective misadaptions
Saskatchewan	--	Socially, emotionally or behaviourally disabled
Yukon Territory	Emotionally handicapped	Special needs student

Services Available

Services available in each of the provinces generally support the notion of a continuum of educational services (Gearhart et al., 1988). This particular model is the accepted standard in the United States as a result of P.L. 94-142. In addition to the number of service options, various professionals appear to be available for either direct service or consultation. Based on reported information from the provincial/territorial jurisdictions, no particular service mode was required. It appears that a school system can make a decision on the most appropriate placement based on the individual needs of a child.

However, two jurisdictions-- Newfoundland and the Northwest Territories--prohibit the utilization of full time self-contained classrooms. In Nova Scotia, a full time self-contained classroom is an option, but is discouraged at the provincial level. In the province of Prince Edward Island, there is only one such classroom for adolescents located in a treatment centre.

Services available in the Csapo (1981) study and the current survey are compared in Table 3:

Table 3

Comparison of the Types of Services Provided by Provinces/ Territories for Behaviourally Disordered Students in 1981 and 1988

Service type	1981	1988
Special class	Alta BC Man Nfld Nwt Ont Sask Que	Alta BC Man NB Ont Que Sask
Resource room	Alta BC Man Nfld NWT NS Ont Que PEO Sask Yukon	Alta BC Man NB Nfld NS Ont Que PEI Sask Yukon
Crisis intervention	BC Man NB Ont Que Sask Yukon	Alt BC Man NB Nfld Ont Yukon
Itinerant teacher	Alta BC Man NB Ont Que Sask	Alta BC Man Nwt Ont Sask Yukon
Academic tutoring	BC Man Nfld NS Ont Que PEI Sask Yukon	Alta BC Man NWT NS Ont PEI Sask Yukon

Homebound instruction	Alta BC Man	Alta BC Man
	Nfld NS Ont	NB NWT NS
	Que PEI Sask	Ont PEI Sask
		Yukon Que
Guidance counselor	Alta BC Man	Alta BC Man
	NB Nfld NWT	NB Nfld NWT
	NS Ont Que	NS Ont PEI
	PEI Sask Yukon	Sask Yukon
School social worker	Alta BC Man	Alta BC Man
	Nfld NWT NS	NB Nfld NWT
	Ont Que PEI	NS Ont Que
	Sask	PEI Sask Yukon
School psychologist	BC Man NS	Alta BC Man
	Ont Que Sask	NB Ont PEI
		NS Ont PEI
Psychiatric consultation	BC Man NB	Alta BC Man
	Nfld NWT NS	NB Nfld NWT
	Ont Que PEI	NS Ont PEI
	Sask	Sask Yukon

Legend:	Alta	Alberta	NWT	Northwest Territories
	BC	British Columbia	Ont	Ontario
	Man	Manitoba	PEI	Prince Edward Island

NB	New Brunswick	Que	Quebec
Nfld	Newfoundland	Sask	Saskatchewan
NS	Nova Scotia		

The responses provided here do not ensure that all programs are available in all school districts. These responses indicate that the service is available in the province but individual school districts may offer only those services they believe necessary.

It is apparent from the information provided in Table 3 that most jurisdictions have maintained a wide variety of services for behaviourally disordered students. The exceptions to these are: Newfoundland, Northwest Territories, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island who have rejected a continuum of service model in favour of an exclusively mainstreaming approach.

Standards Prescribed by Provincial Law or Regulation

A. Maximum Number of Students per Special Class

In Csapo's (1981) study, five of the twelve jurisdictions reported prescribed maximum numbers of students per special class. In the current study six provinces/territories also have regulations regarding special class size. The following table compares reports on class size as required by regulations from the 1981 to 1988 study:

Maximum Number of Students Per Class

(Indicated by grade where known)

	1981	1988
Newfoundland	6	4
Ontario	8	8
Yukon Territory	10-12	To Grade 7: No maximum Grade 7 & 8: Maximum 10 Grade 10-12: Maximum 12
Quebec	12	JK: 8-10 K-6: 10 - 12 Grade 7-12: 12 -14
Alberta	10	No provincially regulated class size
New Brunswick	None reported	Grade 1-6: 8 Grade 7-12: 10

B. Maximum Number of Years a Child can be Enrolled in Special Class

In the 1981 study no provinces or territories reported a prescribed limit on the number of years a child could be enrolled in a special class for behavioural disorders. In the current study only Quebec reported a specific length of stay: Junior Kindergarten is one year; seven years for Grades one to six; and no limit for children twelve years and older.

C. Prescribed Caseload for Resource Teachers and Other Support Staff

In the 1981 study information was provided only for the caseload with respect to resource teachers. The following is a comparison of this information:

	1981	1988
Alberta	1:25	No limits are set provincially
British Columbia	none reported	none reported
Manitoba	3 to 5% of the regular caseload	10 elementary 12 secondary
Newfoundland	1:4	1:4
Northwest Territories	none reported	1:15 responsibility for development of I.R.P.
Nova Scotia	determined at local level	25 (average)
Ontario	not set by Ministry	not set by Ministry
Quebec	1:10-12	psychoeducator or resource 1:613

Prince Edward Island	none reported	1:1 for severe difficulties - no more general figures
Saskatchewan	none reported	1:8
Yukon Territory	1:10-12	1:10-12

In the 1988 study, an additional area of interest was the caseload of other related professionals in the mental health field who support teachers working with behaviourally disordered youngsters.

Three provinces reported. In Nova Scotia; School Social Workers have an average of 100 students on their caseload, and School Psychologists have a caseload of 75-100 students. In Quebec, School Social Workers are available for every 5229 students. For School Psychologists the ratio is 1:2076. Yukon Territory reported one Crisis Counsellor for every 350 students.

D. Eligibility for Special Services

The 1981 study reported that specific procedures for eligibility and placement for special services were required in 6 of the 12 jurisdictions (Alberta, British Columbia, Newfoundland, Ontario, Saskatchewan, and Yukon Territory). In the current 1988 survey it was reported

that all 12 jurisdictions have some formal procedures for eligibility and placement. In 1981, a psychiatric evaluation was required by Saskatchewan. In 1988 both Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia reported that they required a psychiatric evaluation whenever possible.

The identifying procedures usually include a multidisciplinary team guided in this process by a Coordinator of Special Education/Supervisor of Student Services. Parents are involved in the process primarily with regard to providing permission for formalized assessment and for the placment of the child. No jurisdiction reported parent involvement that would parallel the American model of having parents contribute to the development of a written plan. The concept of appeal regarding the school system's decision seems to be firmly part of the identification and placement process in all jurisdictions.

E. Readiness for Reintegration

In 1981 it was an avowed objective of programs for behavioural disordered students to reintegrate into the regular stream. Some jurisdictions used the procedure of an annual review to determine whether the child continued with special service (Alberta, Ontario, and Saskatchewan). In the cases of the Yukon and Northwest Territories it was reported in Csapo's study that these

two jurisdictions addressed the issue of reintegration. However, it was not clear as to how this was accomplished. In Quebec, it was reported that a request to the director was necessary subsequent to the formation of an evaluation team.

Information provided by the provinces/territories with regard to the reintegration issue:

Alberta.

"I.E.P.'s are expected to contain target dates for the reintegration process. In addition, school systems are expected to have integration strategies, provide for continuous evaluation and provide program modification. The special education team (at the school level), in consultation with parents, determines the most appropriate method and degree of reintegration."

British Columbia.

"Determined on an individual basis in the school district."

Manitoba.

"Gradual reintegration leading towards full integration."

New Brunswick.

"All students are integrated."

Newfoundland.

"Under this program no student ever completely leaves the regular progam unless hospitalization is necessary." It appears from reported information that although students receive service in special settings, very close links are maintained with the regular classroom.

Northwest Territories.

"Strictly mainstreaming."

Nova Scotia.

"Very few children leave regular programs on the basis of this label. Two hospital programs within the province provide service to the most difficult students. Within this hospital setting students attend classes. If a youngster is able to be integrated into a regular school setting he/she attends a school in the community but remains a patient at the hospital in the early reintegration process."

Ontario.

"Annual reviews are required by provincial regulation. Parents may request a review after three months. Discussions regarding reintegration would occur during these review meetings. No policy exists in this province other than the understanding that reintegration will be responded to on an individual basis."

Prince Edward Island.

"All students integrated."

Quebec.

"Procedures under review."

Saskatchewan.

"An annual review is required of every placement. This review is initiated by the Director of Education and evidence must be provided to the Department of Education that this review has taken place."

Yukon Territory.

"When a child achieves the goals set out in the I.E.P."

Estimation of the Percentage of Behaviourally Disordered Students Returned to Regular Classes During the Year

In the 1981 study only 5 of the 12 jurisdiction provided estimates of the percentage of behaviourally disordered students returned to the regular classroom: British Columbia (2%), Manitoba (60%), Ontario (10%), Quebec (20%), Yukon Territory (25-35%). In the 1988 study 5 of the 12 jurisdictions reported: Alberta (90%), British Columbia (30%), Manitoba (10%), New Brunswick (30%), Yukon (10%). Responses from other jurisdictions were not provided because they were unavailable or a self-contained classroom was not an

option. These figures are estimates of this practice. No attempt was made to verify these numbers by the provincial/territorial authorities. Some of the differences between the provinces may be accounted for by the universal difficulty in the identification process and varying levels of tolerance among school systems for behaviour problems.

Mode of Service

As was the case in 1981, the predominant mode of organization and delivery of special education services to behaviourally disordered students in the 1988 study is the local school district. The following provinces/territories continue to have the local boards responsible for these programs: Alberta, British Columbia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Ontario, Saskatchewan. Manitoba and Quebec used the local school district in 1981 and have since allowed districts to form joint agreements to serve these students. Prince Edward Island has changed over this same period of time from primarily provincial control and the involvement of private organizations, to local control by the individual school systems. The Northwest Territories have moved from a reliance on social services to sending youngsters to southern Ontario for service, to control by local school boards and regional

school authorities. The Yukon Territory has moved from local school districts to a service model controlled by the Territorial Department of Education.

Assessing Program Effectiveness

In 1981, ten of the twelve jurisdictions indicated that no program evaluation had occurred since 1970. Manitoba reported that school systems normally evaluate their special education programs. The only jurisdiction with a formal evaluation was the Northwest Territories. Of the twelve jurisdictions reporting in 1988 four required some form of evaluation. This varied from the notation by Ontario that boards are expected to report to the Ministry every two years; to a detailed evaluation of the Education Therapist program in Newfoundland. There was no indication by Newfoundland authorities as to the form of this evaluation. British Columbia reported that school systems are expected to carry out regular evaluations. Alberta, as recently as 1987 has developed a document entitled "Program Adequacy in Special Education." This document focuses on an evaluation of all special education programs which appears to be the aim of two other provinces discussed previously. The only province that appears to be addressing specifically the evaluation of progams for

behaviourally disordered students is the province of Newfoundland.

Funding

Csapo (1981) reported that seven of the twelve jurisdictions had no financial formulae for funding special programs for behaviourally disordered students. In 1988, the following provinces/territories funded on the basis of a block grant for all special education: Alberta, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Northwest Territories, Nova Scotia, Ontario, Quebec and Yukon Territory. Three of the provinces fund on the basis of categorical designation: British Columbia, Prince Edward Island and Saskatchewan. Manitoba provides block funding for high incidence exceptionalities and categorical funding for low incidence handicaps.

Requirements of Special Training for Teachers

Manitoba, Newfoundland and Ontario were the only jurisdictions reported in the 1981 study that required special education qualification before funding could be applied. In the 1988 study, six of the twelve jurisdictions utilized the phrase "may include special education studies" and those provinces/territories are: Alberta, British Columbia, New Brunswick, Northwest Territories, Prince Edward Island and Yukon Territory. Six of the jurisdictions actually require course work in

special education. These include: Manitoba, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Ontario, Quebec and Saskatchewan. Newfoundland appears to be the only province/territory that requires specific training for people working in the area of behavioural disorders. This province addresses the needs of behaviourally disordered youngsters through the utilization of professionals that must have the competencies of both a teacher and a counsellor. These competencies are legislated and include the following:

1. Assessment and diagnostic skills in cognitive and personality areas of behaviour.
2. A high level of counselling/behaviour change skill, preferably encompassing a variety of counselling techniques rather than adherence to one particular "school" or method.
3. Good counselling skills with parents and colleagues in schools as well as with other professionals (Newfoundland, 1987).

The only model described in the literature which is similar to the Newfoundland Educational Therapist role is the "Educateur" which combines the skills of teacher and counsellor and trains teachers for positions across settings ranging from the classroom teaching to

counsellor positions in residential settings. One source that discusses this approach quite extensively is a text by Brendtro & Ness (1983).

Summary and Discussion

The major purpose of this study was to update the information concerning the present state of educational service provisions for behaviourally exceptional students in Canada. A questionnaire was sent to the special education branch of each provincial and territorial Ministry/Department of Education and a 100% return rate was achieved. The results describe present practice and provide a comparison with a similar study completed in 1981. The subsequent discussion will describe the present situation, compare current results with the 1981 study, and will also suggest trends that are emerging.

Defining the population of students having behavioural disorders appears to be a continuing difficulty. Of the twelve jurisdictions surveyed ten different definitions were provided. In one province determination of behavioural exceptionality is determined by mental health professionals and in another province the determination is the responsibility of a Regional Special Needs coordinator. In some provinces that have a provincial definition local boards can

adjust the definition to fit their needs thus making the issue even more complex. In two jurisdictions, determination of behaviourally exceptional is done in conjunction with mental health professionals while in most of the other provinces and territories the decision regarding the identification of children with behavioural disorders is the responsibility of educational personnel. Despite the fact that more jurisdictions have a provincially recognized definition than was reported in the 1981 study, the issue now is still just as cloudy. Two provinces, one of which is currently re-examining its definition, rely on the Bower model used in P.L. 94-142 which has also undergone some extensive criticism as an appropriate definition for educational use (Kauffman, 1985). It appears that Canadian educational authorities need to work together in order to arrive at a consistent definition to be used across Canada. Without such consistency, called for by Csapo in 1981, not only is comparison across provinces/territories inappropriate for research purposes but individuals across the country may be treated quite differently depending on the definition used and who is determined qualified to place that definition on a student.

The prevalence rate across the jurisdictions ranged from .0002% to 2%. This can partially be accounted for by definitional differences. One province used the U.S. Bureau of Education for the handicapped figure as its prevalence rate (a similar figure was used in the 1981 study) but upon further questioning it was learned .0002% is currently identified as severely behaviourally disordered. In light of the Ontario Child Mental Health study (Offord, et al., 1987) which found that 18% of children are behaviourally disordered it appears that this type of student is clearly being underidentified. More effort should be made to clearly understand who is being identified, who is doing the identifying, and how many students are placed in this category throughout the country. Only by doing so can adequate funding and educational provisions be provided.

As indicated earlier there is a shift in the terminology used to represent students with emotional/behavioural disorders. Unlike the United States which, as far as federal terminology is concerned has rejected the use of the term behavioural in place of emotional, four jurisdictions used the term behavioural exclusively and three other jurisdictions have incorporated the term behavioural alongside emotional to represent this population. The authors see this as a

positive sign and would suggest that the other provinces and territories follow this trend. Three jursidictions do not use any label at all preferring to place students according to educational need without the application of a label. Though commendable in its intent the reluctance to clearly identify this population causes difficulties in ensuring that all students are being properly identified and receiving appropriate service.

Of major interest is the trend occurring across Canada to mainstream behaviourally disordered students. Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and Northwest Territories do not make any provision for special classes. New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island have very limited provisions for special class placement, while the remaining jursdictions all have a cascade of service available but emphasize integration as an appropriate educational placement. This trend, identified by Csapo in 1981, has continued. Unfortunately there is still not sufficient research to support one type of classroom placement over the other. It is the authors' contention that a full cascade of services should be available in every jurisdiction throughout Canada. By only relying on one type of class, certain students with serious behavioural disorders may require a type of class

placement which is not available. However, the authors also subscribe to the statement in the position paper prepared by the executive committee of the Council for Children with Behavioural Disorders (1987, p.16): "...that all feasible alternatives available within the regular education should be carefully considered prior to the use of special education alternatives."

Special class maximum enrollment still ranges from 6-12 students with no provincially regulated maximums for the amount of time a student can be enrolled in a special class. New Brunswick, which reported having maximums for class size in 1981 did not report this information in 1987.

The prescribed caseload for support staff varied from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. The lightest caseload was in Newfoundland where their educational therapist model allows for a 4:1 ratio while Alberta which had a 25:1 ratio for their resource teachers in 1981 now has no provincially regulated caseload requirement.

The current study also found that the caseload for related professionals was also quite different across the country. Though most areas have social workers, psychologists and psychiatrists available no provincially regulated guidelines for their use with

behaviourally exceptional students is indicated. In regard to the involvement of related professionals, only Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia report that whenever possible a psychiatric evaluation is required before eligibility for service as a behaviourally/emotionally disordered student is determined.

In all cases eligibility for service is determined by a team usually composed of special and regular education personnel and the coordinator of special services or his/her designate. Often there is considerable input from related mental health professionals. Parents are involved and have rights of appeal but in several provinces this is not a regulated right. As indicated earlier legislation similar to 94-142's provisions for parents involvement in programming does not exist in Canada.

In those provinces that have a cascade approach, integration is emphasized quite heavily. Several provinces and both territories report that integration is very much a part of their program expectations and that in those jurisdictions that have segregated settings for the behaviourally exceptional, some partial integration into the regular stream is expected to take place. This emphasis on integration is, in most cases,

not a provincially mandated requirement but appears to be a result of the belief by teachers and administrators that integration for some of these students is an appropriate method of treatment. Further investigation of the acceptance of these students by regular classroom teachers and the support services available at the local level would have to take place to determine the effectiveness of this integration but for the moment the trend toward partial and full integration occurring throughout Canada without the benefit of legislation appears to be a most positive finding.

Despite the fact that considerable integration is occurring little research is conducted by the provinces that have a cascade model to determine how many students withdrawn for special class placement are placed back full-time in a regular class setting. As indicated earlier, among those provinces reporting such information, there exists a wide discrepancy of the percent of students that are reintegrated full-time. This discrepancy may be a result of the different levels of behavioural disorders that jurisdictions may place in segregated classes as opposed to different emphasis being placed on reintegration. Further research in this area should be done by all the provinces.

Except for Yukon Territory, all jurisdictions in

Canada allow the local school board or school district to organize and provide service for behaviourally exceptional students. Local boards appear to have great autonomy over their special eduation service delivery and, except where certain special classes are prohibited, can provide whatever range of service they decide necessary. Though local control is emphasized in most jurisdictions, further research should be conducted in each area to ensure that there is some equity of service being provided throughout the country.

Program evaluation is still a serious problem throughout the country. Newfoundland is the only province that appears to have addressed the evaluation of programs for the behaviourally disordered and though some provinces/territories have suggested guidelines for program evaluation no formal procedures to directly examine program effectiveness has taken place at the provincial/territorial level. It is possible that local boards have undertaken such an examination but that information was not included in the present survey. It is the authors' contention that the provinces and territories should undertake such a study, perhaps jointly, to determine if their program models are effective and that positive change is taking place.

Funding appears to have improved since the 1981 study. All jurisdictions now report that funds are made available by the provincial or territorieal governments to local boards for either special education service in general (in the form of a block grant) or for specific service (in the form of a categorical grant). This study did not undertake to examine whether or not these funds are sufficient. It does appear, however, that governments have made special education a priority and are attempting to fund service more than they had before. Whether these funds are being allocated by the local boards to generate service for behaviourally exceptional students would have to be more closely examined.

Except for Newfoundland which has very specific criteria, no other jurisdiction has required courses for teachers placed in classes for students with behavioural disorders. Though some areas suggest that teachers take certain courses before being placed in categorical programs no requirement for this to be done has yet been passed. In Ontario, a special education course must be taken but it need not be in the area of behavioural exceptionality. It is left to the local boards/districts to place teachers in classrooms and they are left to decide who is qualified. Provincial

officials do not appear to recognize the need for specific training of teachers who instruct behaviourally disordered students to the extent of making such training mandatory.

Conclusions

This study reported that the provincial and territorial governments are attempting to deal with the education of behaviourally disordered students. In all cases provision for their education has been made and it is generally agreed that these students require educational service and are receiving service. There are certainly some differences across the country on how this delivery of service should take place but it is more a question of degree of integration and service provision than it is a question relegating the responsibility of their education onto someone else.

More importantly, it is evident that the governments of these jurisdictions are expecting behaviourally disordered students to receive an appropriate education but that they do not have a clear understanding of what is happening throughout their jurisdictions at the local level. Provinces/territories need to conduct more extensive research into the prevalence rate, methods of identification, educational

models being used, funding allocation/utilization and hiring practices. Provincial/territorial authorities also need to examine the effects of their laissez-faire attitude toward specific training for teachers of behaviourally diordered students.

Canada has improved its educational service to students with behavioural disorders but this country, like the United States, still needs to move further in order to ensure that students requiring assistance are getting the most effective instruction from the most qualified individuals in the most appropriate settings. We are not there yet.

References

Bower, E., & Lambert, N. (1971). In-school screening for children with emotional handicaps. In N. Long, W. Mouse, & R. Newman, (Eds.), Conflict in the classroom (2nd ed.). Belmont, California: Wordsworth.

Brendtro, L.K., & Ness, A.E. (1983). Re-educating troubled youth: Environments for teaching and treatment. New York: Aldine Publishing.

Council for Exceptional Children, Committee Canadian (1971). Standards for educators of exceptional children in Canada. Toronto: Leonard Crainford.

Csapo, M. (1981). The behaviourally disordered child in Canada's schools. Behaviour Disorders. 6(3), 139-149.

Gearhart, B.R., Weishahn, M.W., & Gearhart, C.J. (1988). The exceptional student in the regular classroom. Columbus: Merrill.

Hirshoren, A., Schultz, E.W., Manton, A.B., & Henderson, R. (1970). A survey of public school special educating programs for emotionally disturbed children. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No., ED 050 54)

Kauffman, J.M. (1985). Characteristics of children's behaviour disorders. (3rd ed.), Columbus: Merrill.

Offord, D.R., Boyle, M.H., Szatmari, P., Rae-Grant, N.I., Links, P.L., Cadman, D.T., Byles, J.A. Crawford, J.W., Bloom-Monroe, H., Byrne, C., Thomas, H., & Woodward, C.A. (1987). Ontario Child Health Study: Vol.II. Six month prevalence of disorder and rates of service